

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-13, and 15-23 are pending in the present application. All of these claims stand rejected. The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and request reconsideration in light of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 3-13, and 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Jones et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,088,800). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

With respect to independent claim 1, the present Office Action maintains that Jones teaches all of the elements of this claim. In particular, the Office Action asserts that the claimed element of "said register file includes general purpose registers" is specifically taught by Jones. The Applicants respectfully disagree and again submit that the register files taught by Jones, such as register file 58 in FIG. 3, do not include general purpose registers. As argued in previous responses, col. 7, lines 15-38 of Jones specifically teach that the register file 58 is limited to providing 32-bit words to the ALU 56. In contrast, claim 1 features a "general purpose register," which is typically addressable and can be used for different purposes such as an accumulator, an index register or a special handler of video.

In response to Applicant's previous arguments, the present Office Action asserts that the Applicants previously argued that Jones does not disclose a register file providing operands to an ALU. This was not Applicants' argument. Rather, as argued above, Applicants submit that Jones does not disclose a general purpose register for providing operands to an ALU. Rather, Jones teaches a specific register file limited to providing 32-bit words to the ALU.

Additionally, the present Office Action asserts that col. 7, line 65 through col. 8, line 29 of Jones "makes it clear that any register can be used to enhance the instruction set performing the necessary operations within the cryptographic procedure." From this referenced disclosure, it appears that the Office Action is alleging that this teaching is commensurate with a teaching of general purpose registers. In response, Applicants respectfully submit that the import of the cited section of Jones is not teaching the use of any type of register, which could include a general purpose register, but rather that any of the special purpose registers taught by Jones can be used as an operand to any instruction given that the instruction set of Jones is more or less orthogonal. That is, the PE instruction memory 62 may provide an instruction set to any of the register files 58 through the control unit 60 in any of the processing elements 37. One of ordinary skill in the art, reading the cited section in its context, would not equate the language "any register" as being

any type of register, but instead any of the registers 58 within the processing elements 37 being able to receive the instruction set from the PE instruction memory 62. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the reasoning presented in the present Office Action is not tenable and that Jones indeed does not teach or suggest the use of general purpose registers.

In light of the forgoing comments, the Applicants respectfully submit that Jones does not teach all of the elements of claim 1 and that this claim is allowable over the prior art of record.

With respect to dependent claims 3-12 and 23, which ultimately depend from independent claim 1, these claims are submitted to be allowable on their merits and also due to their dependency on independent claim 1.

With respect to independent claim 13, this claim features similar elements to claim 1, namely a register file including general purpose registers. As argued previously, at least this element is not taught or suggested by Jones et al. Accordingly, this claim is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons presented above.

With respect to dependent claims 15-21, which ultimately depend from independent claim 13, these claims are submitted to be allowable on their merits and also due to their dependency on independent claim 13.

With respect to dependent claim 22, this claim is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons presented above with respect to independent claim 1.

In light of the forgoing comments the Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable over the prior art of record and request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Patrick B. Law
Reg. No. 41,549

Date: April 8, 2005

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
Telephone: (312) 609-7500
Facsimile: (312) 609-5005
email: plaw@vedderprice.com

CHICAGO/#1355102.1